

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated May 9, 2006 (the “Office Action”).

Claims 1-20 were previously pending.

Claims 1-7 and 10-20 stand rejected.

Claims 8 and 9 are objected to. Applicants assert that these claims are allowable by virtue of their dependence upon claim 1, which is allowable over the cited art for the reasons set forth below. However, Applicants will rewrite these claims in independent form at a later time if necessary..

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-7 and 10-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dalal, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0123063 (hereinafter referred to as “Dalal”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Dalal fails to anticipate, teach, or suggest a method involving “first, second and third devices each storing a respective copy of the data volume layout description or respective modified versions thereof in respective memories of the first, second and third devices,” as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner cites paragraph 267 as anticipating the above-quoted feature of claim 1. Office Action, p. 3. Paragraph 267 of Dalal states:

Virtual object hierarchy 2260 is used to produce commands 2270 to configure a logical volume having the logical volume configuration 2260. These commands are executed to configure a logical volume from one or more physical storage devices. In this example, commands to create 15 subdisks are first issued, with each command indicating an identifier for a respective disk (d1 through d15) within Disk Array 2 to be used. The 15 columns are then created, and each subdisk is associated with a respective column.

Thus, the above-quoted portion of Dalal describes how various commands can be executed to configure a logical volume from multiple disks within a disk array. This portion of Dalal does not describe storing any information in the memories of three devices, however, let

alone storing a data volume layout description in the memories of each of three devices, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, this portion of Dalal (both alone and in combination with the other cited portions of Dalal) neither teaches such a feature nor suggests that such a feature would be desirable. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the cited art for at least the foregoing reason, as are dependent claims 2-7 and 9-10. Claims 11-20 are patentable over the cited art for similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AE, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450, on July 7, 2006.


Brenna A. Brock
Attorney for Applicant

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Brenna A. Brock
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 48,509
Telephone: (512) 439-5087
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099